

1 **Flattening the curve and the effect of atypical events on mitigation measures in Mexico:**
2 **a modeling perspective[†]**

3 **Authors:** M. Santana-Cibrian^{1,2,4}, M. A. Acuña-Zegarra³, J. X. Velasco-Hernandez^{1,4}

4 ¹ Instituto de Matematicas, UNAM-Juriquilla

5 ² CONACyT - Instituto de Matematicas, UNAM-Juriquilla

6 ³ Departamento de Matematicas, Universidad de Sonora.

7 ⁴ Nodo Multidisciplinario de Matematicas Aplicadas, Instituto de Matematicas UNAM-Juriquilla

8 **Corresponding author: M. A. Acuña-Zegarra.**

9 Departamento de Matematicas, Universidad de Sonora.

10 **adrian.acuna@unison.mx**

[†]COVID-19 atypical transmission events

11 **Abstract:**

12 On 23 and 30 March 2020 the Mexican Federal government implemented social distancing measures
13 to mitigate the COVID-19 epidemic. We use a mathematical model to explore atypical transmission
14 events within the confinement period, triggered by the timing and strength of short time perturbations
15 of social distancing. We show that social distancing measures were successful in achieving a
16 significant reduction of the effective contact rate in the early weeks of the intervention. However,
17 "flattening the curve" had an undesirable effect, since the epidemic peak was delayed too far, almost
18 to the government preset day for lifting restrictions (01 June 2020). If the peak indeed occurs in late
19 May or early June, then the events of children's day and mother's day may either generate a later
20 peak (worst case scenario), a long plateau with relatively constant but high incidence (middle case
21 scenario) or the same peak date as in the original baseline epidemic curve, but with a post-peak
22 interval of slower decay.

23 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Mathematical model, Mitigation, Atypical events.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 On 23 March 2020, the Mexican Federal government officially established mitigation measures
26 to control the COVID-19 epidemic. All public and private schools were closed and a set of
27 non-mandatory social distancing recommendations was issued. One week later, on 30 March 2020,
28 a Sanitary Emergency was declared, ordering the suspension of all non-essential activities in the
29 public and private sectors, until 30 April 2020, a date that was later extended to 01 June 2020.
30 The aim of these measures was to lower the incidence to manageable levels in terms of the expected
31 number of critical cases [1]. On 16 April 2020, the federal government announced that, for Mexico
32 City, the epidemic peak (day of maximum incidence) would occur on 08-10 May 2020 [2,3]. On May
33 8th, this estimate was corrected and moved to no later than 20 May 2020 [4,5]. A gradual lifting
34 of social-distancing measures was announced to start on 01 June 2020. Unfortunately, government
35 predictions seem to be underestimating the time of maximum incidence, since the epidemic curve
36 has not shown clear signs of having reached the peak by mid-May. If conditions remain constant

37 with respect to the population compliance of the mitigation measures, then the peak could occur
38 by late May or early June [6, 7], coinciding with the date set for the lifting of social-distancing.
39 However, things may be more complicated than this. There are two holidays, children's day and
40 mother's day, where mobility increases; these events may have an important impact on the epidemic
41 curve and thus on the strategy to implement the lifting of social-distancing, not considered in the
42 early forecasts.

43 In this paper, we explore the possible impact of such short time periods where the population
44 does not follow the social distancing measures, and use Mexico City as an example to show the
45 consequences of different scenarios. First, in Section 2 we explain the methods and data used for
46 the analysis. Then, in Section 3, we describe the current situation of the COVID-19 pandemic in
47 Mexico City, including an evaluation of the mitigation measures using the Richards model. Then,
48 using a Kermack-McKendrick model [6], we generate scenarios that describe the impact of the two
49 aforementioned holidays on the shape of the epidemic curve for Mexico City. Finally, the discussion
50 and conclusions are presented in Section 4.

51 **2 Methods**

52 **2.1 Data source**

53 Data for the COVID-19 epidemic was provided by the Secretaría de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación
54 of the Government of Mexico City through the COVID-19-CDMX database [8]. This data set
55 contains details on all the confirmed and suspected COVID-19 individuals such as sex, age, residence
56 region, date of symptoms onset, etc. Records are available from 22 February 2020 to 19 May 2020.
57 Due to reporting delays and delays imposed by the incubation period of the virus, we do not use
58 the last 14 days of data in all of our estimations.

59 2.2 Richards model

We fit the Richards model to the epidemic curve [9] to estimate the growth rate for two different periods, 22 February 2020 to 22 March 2020, and 23 March 2020 to 27 April 2020, to have an approximation of the reduction in the growth rate r resulting from the social distancing measures implemented by the federal government. We assume that the cumulative cases curve of COVID-19, $C(t)$, can be described by the solution of

$$C'(t) = rC(t) \left[1 - \left(\frac{C(t)}{K} \right)^a \right], \quad (1)$$

60 where r is the infection growth rate, K is the final epidemic size, and a is a scaling parameter to
61 account for the asymmetry of the epidemic curve. This model is an extension of the simple logistic
62 growth model that has already been used to predict cumulative COVID-19 cases in China [9].

63 The parameters a , r , and K must be estimated from the observed data. We use a statistical
64 approach through Bayesian inference [10, 11]. Technical details of the estimation process can be
65 found in Appendix A.

66 2.3 Mathematical model setup

67 To evaluate the impact of atypical events, we use the model developed in [6] under the scenario
68 that 70% of the general population is confined and 30% is not. This split of the population occurs
69 when social distancing measures are implemented on 23 March 2020. The non-confined population
70 includes workers with essential economic activities in government and industry, or individuals
71 that work in the informal economy. In Mexico City, the informal economy represents 49% of
72 the economically active population [12]. Once under confinement, this population abandons the
73 confinement at a rate ω that we call the confinement-failure rate. This is the parameter we use as
74 a proxy for population mobility. For more details on the mathematical model, we refer the reader
75 to [6]. Figure 1 shows the model diagram.

76 Since individuals under confinement fail to comply with the social-distancing indicatives at a
77 rate ω (baseline $\omega_0 = 0.005/\text{day}$), they become part of the other subpopulation. The model assumes

78 that, in both groups, the effective contact rate is actually reduced, but the subpopulation under
79 confinement has the largest reduction of the two.

80 In the next section, we model the atypical increase in mobility on children's and mother's days
81 as follows: i) in each case, we assume the increased mobility lasts only for a period of τ days, and
82 ii) the increased mobility on these dates is reflected on an increase of the compliance-failure rate
83 ω_0 by a factor k . For these dates, the new compliance-failure rate is $k\omega_0$.

84 **3 Results**

85 **3.1 Effect of mitigation measures**

86 Confirmed cases of COVID-19 epidemic in Mexico can be presented in several forms. Figure 2
87 shows confirmed cumulative cases reported by date of symptoms onset, by the date of arrival at the
88 hospital, and by the date when tests were confirmed. It also shows that the growth pattern in each
89 one is different. For example, if we focus on cases reported by the date of test confirmation (green
90 bars), the cumulative cases show that the epidemic is still in the exponential growth period. On
91 the other hand, for the cases reported by symptoms onset (blue bars), cumulative cases show linear
92 growth. In this work we use this last representation (symptoms onset) since it describes the growth
93 of the epidemic in terms of active cases. Figure 3 shows the number of confirmed and suspected cases
94 by symptoms onset. Suspected cases are those individuals that present COVID-19-like symptoms
95 but are still waiting for test results. As of 19 May 2020, in Mexico City, there are 6973 suspected
96 cases, which amounts to 46% of the 15283 confirmed cases at the same date. Certainly, not all
97 suspected cases will be confirmed as COVID-19 cases. If we consider that the positivity rate in
98 Mexico City is approximately 35%, then 2440 of those 6973 suspects will be confirmed, a fraction
99 that represents 16% of the total confirmed cases. The still increasing tendency of the number of
100 suspected cases shown to date, lends support to the hypothesis that for Mexico City the peak of the
101 epidemic has yet to be reached. This is an important consideration regarding the end of confinement
102 measures and the impact of atypical events on the dynamics of transmission on the shape of the
103 epidemic curve.

104 We have already pointed out that some suspected cases are waiting for test results, but it is
105 equally possible that many of them are yet to be tested. According to the official daily published
106 data, the number of tests has dropped significantly since the first week of May (Figure 4). This
107 does not necessarily mean that there are fewer tests but rather, that there is an important delay in
108 the reporting of results. This possibility is consistent with Figure 3 that shows that the number of
109 suspected cases has indeed increased since the beginning of May. It is possible too that there is a
110 saturation in the laboratories that apply the tests and this could be causing a lag in the reported
111 cases or that tests for the general population are being canalized elsewhere due to the increase
112 in mortality and hospitals' demand. This also could explain why there are many suspected cases
113 that started symptoms in March and April that have not yet been confirmed. In summary, the
114 most recent observations of the number of confirmed cases are still incomplete. It will take at least
115 two weeks before we have data to conclusively decide whether Mexico City is really close to the
116 maximum incidence peak or not.

117 **3.2 Reduction in epidemic growth rate**

118 Table 1 shows the parameter estimates for the two periods. It can be seen that, before the start
119 of social distancing on 23 March 2020, the growth rate is approximately 1.062 with a 95% interval
120 (0.408,3.197). After 23 March 2020, the growth rate is 0.103 with a 95% interval of (0.096, 0.119).
121 This gives us an average reduction of 90% of the epidemic growth rate in the early days of the
122 implementation of social distancing measures. Figure 5 shows the observed daily data and the fit
123 of the model before and after the isolation measures. Richards model also provides information
124 about the maximum cumulative incidence (epidemic size). Our estimations project, at the date
125 of writing, a maximum incidence to occur between 22-May and 15 June, 2020. Given the overall
126 decreasing magnitude of the reproductive number R_t (described below) at the time of writing, we
127 cautiously provide results for K as an illustration of a possible scenario (see Table 1).

128 Figure 6 shows the evolution of the instantaneous reproduction number R_t in Mexico City until
129 5 May 2020, four days after mother's day. It is computed using the algorithm in [13,14] with a
130 mean intergenerational period of 4.7 days [15]. Note that the R_t trend shows a slight increase

131 just around 30 April and 01 May. Transmission events occurring in these days will be reflected
132 within 14 days, both as increased incidence and mortality. At the date of writing, we still do
133 not have the information to explore this possibility. We can conclude, however, that although
134 the social-distancing measures were indeed effective by reducing transmission as evidenced by the
135 reduction of the epidemic growth rate after 23 March 2020, they also pushed the peak towards the
136 end of the month, at the earliest.

137 **3.3 Effect of atypical events on social-distancing measures**

138 In Mexico, social-distancing measures are focused on social-distancing and non-pharmaceutical
139 interventions (NPIs) to reduce contact between individuals. However, in Mexico City, increases in
140 population mobility that last a few days have been observed [16]. This increased mobility weakens
141 the strength of the NPIs and, therefore, may have an impact on disease transmission. This section
142 explores the consequences of bursts of increasing mobility near the peak day of the epidemic curve.

143 As already mentioned before, there are two important holidays (in terms of population mobility)
144 within the period of confinement: 30 April, children's day, and 10 May, mother's day. There exists
145 evidence that population mobility slightly increased [16] in these two days. To study the effect,
146 we use the periods A): 29-30 April 2020, which are weekdays and B): 08-10 May 2020, a weekend.
147 For these periods, the confinement-failure rate is $k\omega_0$, where $k = 2$ or 5 . The magnitude of k is
148 arbitrary but, relative to $\omega_0 = 0.005/day$, it is a small perturbation.

149 Our scenarios are:

- 150 • Scenario I with two cases: I.1) $k = 2$ in A and B, I.2) $k = 5$ in A and B.
- 151 • Scenario II with two cases II.1) $k = 2$ in A, $k = 5$ in B; I.2) $k = 5$ in A, $k = 2$ in B.

152 Scenario I assumes that both periods have equal ω . This is a baseline case since mother's day in
153 Mexico is an extremely important family date whose popularity is well beyond that for children's
154 day. Scenario II addresses this difference. It considers an unequal outflow from social-distancing.
155 We look at the impact of these two events on the epidemic peak, assuming that the peak occurs in
156 early June.

157 Figure 7 shows our simulations for both scenarios. Case I.2 is clearly the worst-case scenario
158 (black dashed line). After the perturbation, the incidence peak is higher and later for several weeks.
159 The epidemic size increases too. Scenario I.1 (black line), on the other hand, is comparatively
160 benign. The peak is still reached on the baseline date, then there is an interval of about a month
161 where the epidemic curve decreases with a lower rate than the baseline case. Afterward, the decrease
162 is essentially at the same speed as that for the original curve (blue). Case II.1 (red dashed line)
163 occurs when the children’s day period (29-30 April) has a lower confinement-failure rate than the
164 mother’s day period (08-10 May). Observe that when the peak is reached, the incidence curve does
165 not show a significant decay but rather, enters into a plateau phase that lasts several weeks after
166 the baseline peak date (blue curve). On the other hand, in scenario II.2 (red line), the largest
167 increase in the confinement-failure rate occurs for fewer days (children’s day period), producing an
168 epidemic curve similar to the one in scenario II.1.

169 **Remark:** We illustrate the effect of these atypical events with the specific holidays above, but
170 the exercise can be viewed in more general terms. Figure 8 shows the consequences of increased
171 mobility in short periods occurring before or after the incidence peak. In this case, the mobility
172 increases for three days by a factor of $k = 10$ times the baseline containment failure rate (i.e.,
173 $\omega = 10\omega_0$). The worst case scenario occurs when the atypical event is located on the exponential
174 growth phase of the curve and far from the maximum incidence (black discontinuous line). A less
175 extreme scenario occurs when the increase in population mobility is located after and far from the
176 incidence peak (green discontinuous line). For completeness, in Appendix B, we show simulations
177 for a mobility increase of only five-fold the baseline value. This scenario is, hopefully, the one that
178 will occur in Mexico City, but at the time of writing, the incidence data for the days around 10
179 May 2020 is still incomplete and the mobility impact cannot be yet verified.

180 4 Conclusions

181 We have presented an analysis of the current COVID-19 epidemic in Mexico, illustrating some
182 of its features with the case of Mexico City. Our analysis shows that social distancing measures

183 implemented by the country's federal health authorities on 23, 30 March 2020 were effective in
184 mitigating the epidemic growth rate in the weeks after this date. This result is supported by our
185 estimate of the reduction of the epidemic growth rate using Richard's model, and also with the
186 sustained downward trend of the effective reproductive number until 29 April 2020 (right up to
187 children's day, on 30 April). The analysis of the precise epidemiological situation in Mexico is
188 difficult because, among other things, the COVID-19 test rate is very low [17]. Moreover, its high
189 positivity rate (in the interval 21% to 40% in Mexico City for the first week of May [8]) indicates
190 a large under-reporting of cases that affects the estimates of true mortality and incidence rates.
191 Our analysis relies on the confirmed cases reported by the General Directorate of Epidemiology.
192 Nevertheless, the available data shows that although the aim of flattening the epidemic curve has
193 been achieved in Mexico City and, on average, in the whole country, the Mexican case shows
194 that mitigation measures cannot be only concerned with spreading the infections over a longer
195 period and reducing the incidence peak. Timing is of utmost importance [18]. For Mexico City, the
196 government originally forecasted the peak to occur by 8-10 May 2020, setting the date for liberation
197 of mitigation measures for 30 May. The peak has not yet been reached by 20 May (when this report
198 is being written), pushing the likely dates for it to occur either close to the end of May or, likely,
199 beyond 01 June 2020, the new revised date set for lifting mobility restrictions and the start of the
200 reactivation of the economy. In this context, events where a high increase in mobility takes place,
201 like what possibly occurred on children's day and mother's day (30 April and 10 May, respectively),
202 may impact the epidemic curve before the peak occurs.

203 We have used a mathematical model previously developed [6], to generate plausible scenarios
204 that may affect the epidemic curve, as related to the timing and strength of perturbations of
205 social distancing measures. We have explored the effect of pulses of unusual activity (within the
206 confinement period) on the epidemic curve of COVID-19 in Mexico City. These are necessarily
207 theoretical results, but we believe they illuminate the importance of counting with reasonable
208 estimates for the timing of maximum incidence. We have already mentioned that mitigation
209 measures will be lifted on 01 June 2020 as announced in early April 2020, and that the current
210 epidemic trend strongly indicates that the peak will occur past the middle of May. If it was to

211 occur in late May or early June as predicted by other models [6,7], then the events of children's day
212 and mother's day may either generate, depending of the magnitude of ω , a later peak (worst case
213 scenario), a long plateau with relatively constant but high incidence (middle case scenario) or the
214 same peak date as in the original baseline epidemic curve but with a post-peak interval of slower
215 decay (Figures 7 and 8).

216 Mathematical models are essential in the fight against COVID-19. They are tools for evaluating
217 mitigation measures, estimating mortality and incidence, and projecting scenarios to help public
218 health decision-makers in their very difficult and important task of controlling the epidemic. In this
219 paper, we have used mathematical models to evaluate and generate scenarios. Although precise
220 forecasting is not our aim, we consider that these results can be helpful for decision-makers.

221 **Authors Contributions**

222 All authors contributed equally.

223 **Acknowledgments**

224 JXVH acknowledges support from DGAPA-PAPIIT-UNAM grant IN115720. We thank the advice
225 and encouragement of Dr. Héctor Benitez, Dr. Ramsés Mena, and Dr. William Lee Ardavín from
226 UNAM. We also thank Ruth Corona for their help during the preparation of this manuscript, and
227 the Secretaría de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación of the Government of Mexico City for facilitating
228 the data on the COVID-19 epidemic.

229 **Competing Interests**

230 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

231 A Parameter estimation of the growth rate

232 Let Y_j , for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, be the number of observed cumulative cases at time t_j , with t_j given in
233 days. We assume that Y_j follows a Negative Binomial distribution with mean value $C(t_j|a, r, K)$
234 and dispersion parameter α . Here, $C(t_j|a, r, K)$ is the solution of Richards model presented in (1).
235 Assuming that, given the parameters, the observations Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n are conditionally independent,
then

$$E[Y_j|a, r, K, \alpha] = C(t_j|a, r, K) \quad (2)$$

$$Var[Y_j|a, r, K, \alpha] = C(t_j|a, r, K) + \alpha C(t_j|a, r, K)^2 \quad (3)$$

236 The Negative Binomial distribution allows to control the variability of the data by considering
237 over-dispersion, which is common for epidemiological data. If $\alpha = 0$, then we return to the Poisson
238 model which is often used in this context.

239 Let $\theta = (a, r, K, \alpha)$ be the vector of parameters to estimate. The inclusion of the parameter
240 α , which is related to the variability of the data, not to the Richards model, is necessary since in
241 practice this variability is unknown. Then, the likelihood function, which represents how likely it
242 is to observe the data under the Negative Binomial assumption and Richards model if we knew the
parameters, is given by

$$\pi(y_1, \dots, y_n|\theta) = \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(y_j + \tau)}{\Gamma(y_j)\Gamma(\tau)} \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau + C(t_j|a, r, K)} \right)^\tau \left(\frac{C(t_j|a, r, K)}{\tau + C(t_j|a, r, K)} \right)^{y_j}. \quad (4)$$

243 Consider the parameters a , r , K , and α as random variables. Assuming prior independence, the
244 joint prior distribution for vector θ is

$$\pi(\theta) = \pi(a)\pi(r)\pi(K)\pi(\alpha),$$

245 where $\pi(a)$ is the probability density function (pdf) of a Uniform(0,1) distribution, $\pi(r)$ is the
246 pdf of a Uniform(0,5), $\pi(K)$ is the pdf of a Uniform(K_{\min} , K_{\max}), and $\pi(\alpha)$ is the pdf of a

247 Gamma(shape=2, scale=0.1). To select the prior for parameter r , we consider that other estimations
248 of r are close to 0.3 [9]. In addition, there is no available prior information regarding the final size
249 of the outbreak K . This is a critical parameter in the model and, to avoid bias, we assume a
250 uniform prior over K_{\min} and K_{\max} . To set these last to values, we consider that the minimum
251 number of confirmed cases is the current number of observed cases $Y(t_n)$ times 10 and 5, i.e.,
252 $K_{\min} = y_n * 10$ and $K_{\min} = y_n * 5$, for the periods before and after 23 March 2020, respectively. To
253 set the upper bound for K , we consider a fraction of the total population $K_{\max} = N * 0.02$, where
254 N is the population size of Mexico City. This fraction was determined base on the observations of
255 other cities such as New York, where the total population size is similar to Mexico City and the
256 proportion of infected represents one of the worst case scenarios up to date.

Then, the posterior distribution of the parameters of interest is

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|y_1, \dots, y_n) \propto \pi(y_1, \dots, y_n|\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

257 and it does not have an analytical form because the likelihood function depends on the solution of
258 the Richards model, which is non-linear in the parameters. We analyze the posterior distribution
259 using an MCMC algorithm that does not require tuning called *t-walk* [19]. This algorithm generates
260 samples from the posterior distribution that can be used to estimate marginal posterior densities,
261 mean, variance, quantiles, etc. We refer the reader to [10] for more details on MCMC methods and
262 to [11] for an introduction to Bayesian inference with differential equations.

263 **B Low rate of mobility**

264 Figure 9a shows the change in the epidemic curve when mobility increases for a single period lasting
265 three days. We show how the location of this perturbation with respect to the peak date, affects the
266 epidemic curve for a low confinement-failure rate ω . If the perturbation occurs in the exponential
267 growth phase, the total incidence (area under the curve Figure 9b) will be higher than when the
268 event is located further to the left of the peak. When the event occurs in the declining phase of the

269 epidemic outbreak, the incidence continues decaying but at a slower pace, generating a net increase
270 on the total number of cases.

271 References

- 272 [1] **Ngonghala CN, et al.** Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical
273 interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical Bioscience*. Published
274 online: 01 May 2020. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108364.
- 275 [2] **Lozano N.** Ssa estima pico máximo de casos por COVID-19 entre 8 y 10 de mayo. *Político.mx*
276 2020; 16 April. (<https://www.politico.mx/minuta-politica/minuta-politica-gobierno-federal/ssa-estima-pico-m%C3%A1ximo-de-casos-por-covid-19-entre-8-y-10-de-mayo/>). Accessed 17 May
277 2020.
278
- 279 [3] **Castillo E.** En Valle de México se prevé fin de epidemia por coronavirus el 25 de junio:
280 López-Gatell. *Milenio* 2020; 16 April. (<https://www.milenio.com/politica/coronavirus-valle-mexico-preven-epidemia-25-junio>). Accessed 17 May 2020.
281
- 282 [4] **As.com.** Curva del coronavirus en México hoy, 8 de mayo:
283 ¿cuántos casos y contagios hay?. *As.com* 2020; 08 May.
284 (https://mexico.as.com/mexico/2020/05/08/tikitakas/1588957771_504845.html). Accessed
285 17 May 2020.
- 286 [5] **Reforma.** La mañanera de AMLO-8 de mayo. *Reforma* 2020; 08 May.
287 (<https://www.reforma.com/aplicacioneslibre/preacceso/articulo/default.aspx?urlredirect=https://www.reforma.com/la-mananera-de-amlo-8-de-mayo/ar1938174?referer=-7d616165662f3a3a6262623b727a7a7279703b767a783a->). Accessed 17 May 2020.
288
289
- 290 [6] **Acuña-Zegarra MA, Santana-Cibrian M, Velasco-Hernandez JX.** Modeling behavioral
291 change and COVID-19 containment in Mexico: A trade-off between lockdown and compliance.
292 *Mathematical Bioscience*. Published online: 06 May 2020. doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108370.

- 293 [7] **Mena R, et al.** Using the posterior predictive distribution to analyse epidemic models:
294 COVID-19 in Mexico City. *arXiv preprint*. arXiv:2005.02294.
- 295 [8] **Covid-19 SINAVE Ciudad de México (COVID-19-CDMX) database.**
296 (<https://datos.cdmx.gob.mx/explore/dataset/base-covid-sinave/table/>). Accessed 14 May
297 2020.
- 298 [9] **Roosa K, et al.** Real-time forecasts of the COVID-19 epidemic in China from February 5th
299 to February 24th, 2020. *Infectious Disease Modelling*. Published online: 14 February 2020.
300 doi:10.1016/j.idm.2020.02.002.
- 301 [10] **Robert CP, Casella G.** Monte Carlo Statistical Methods, 2nd edn. Springer Verlag, 2004.
- 302 [11] **Kaipio J, Somersalo E.** Statistical and computational inverse problems. Springer-Verlag
303 New York, 2005.
- 304 [12] **INEGI.** Resultados de la encuesta nacional de ocupación y empleo.
305 Cifras durante el cuarto trimestre de 2019. *INEGI* 2020; 13 February.
306 (https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/saladeprensa/boletines/2020/enoe_ie/enoe_ie2020_02.pdf).
307 Accessed 19 May 2020.
- 308 [13] **Thompson RN, et al.** Improved inference of time-varying reproduction numbers
309 during infectious disease outbreaks. *Epidemics*. Published online: 26 August 2019.
310 doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2019.100356.
- 311 [14] **Cori A, et al.** A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-Varying Reproduction
312 Numbers During Epidemics. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online: 15 September
313 2013. doi:10.1093/aje/kwt133.
- 314 [15] **Nishiura H, Linton NM, Akhmetzhanov AR.** Serial interval of novel coronavirus
315 (COVID-19) infections. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. Published online: 04 March
316 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.060.

- 317 [16] **Secretaría de Movilidad**. (<https://www.semovi.cdmx.gob.mx/tramites-y-servicios/transparencia/preguntas-frecuentes/preguntas-frecuentes-covid-19/movilidad-durante-la-emergencia-sanitaria-covid-19>). Accessed 15 May 2020.
- 320 [17] **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**. Testing for
321 COVID-19 : A way to lift confinement restrictions, 04 May 2020.
- 322 [18] **Angulo MT, et al**. A simple criterion to design optimal non-pharmaceutical interventions
323 for epidemic outbreaks. *arXiv preprint*.
- 324 [19] **Christen JA, Fox C**. A general purpose sampling algorithm for continuous distributions
325 (the t-walk). *International Society for Bayesian Analysis*. Published online: 2010.
326 doi:10.1214/10-BA603.

	22 February - 22 March			23 March - 27 April		
	Lower	Median	Upper	Lower	Median	Upper
a	0.009	0.031	0.148	0.296	0.510	0.698
K	5,881	51,529	170,214	42,976	65,255	164,821
r	0.408	1.062	3.197	0.096	0.103	0.119

Table 1: Parameter median estimates and 95% posterior probability intervals before and after 23 March 2020. Here, r is the growth rate, K is the final size of the outbreak and a is a scaling factor.




Figure 1: Structure of the mathematical model [6]. The state variables S , E , I_a , I_s , R , D represent the populations of susceptible, exposed, asymptotically infected, symptomatically infected, recovered and dead individuals, respectively. Previous to the Sanitary Emergency measures the epidemics follows the dynamics represented in the blue diagram. Once Sanitary Emergency Measures are implemented the population splits into two: those who comply with the control measures (green box) and those who do not (pink box). The dashed line connecting the green and pink boxes represents the confinement failure rate ω .




Figure 2: Daily and cumulative SARS-CoV-2 cases in Mexico City from 17 February 2020 to 19 May 2020 presented in three different forms: blue bars correspond to cases by symptoms onset, green bars are cases by date of arrival to hospitals, and yellow bars show cases by date when tests were confirmed. Deaths are also showed in red.




Figure 3: Daily confirmed and suspicious SARS-CoV-2 cases in Mexico City from 17 February 2020 to 19 May 2020. Blue bars correspond to cases by symptoms onset, orange bars correspond to confirmed cases plus the suspected cases.




Figure 4: Total COVID-19 tests per thousand people in Mexico City from 22 February 2020 to 19 May 2020.




Figure 5: Daily observed cases and incidence obtained from Richards model: a) from 22 February 2020 to 22 March 2020, and b) from 23 March 2020 to 27 April 2020. Blue bars represent the observed data used to fit the model at each period, and orange bars represent the observed data that was not used. The estimates for maximum incidence are not used in this work.




Figure 6: Instantaneous reproduction number for Mexico City using a median serial interval of 4.7 days following the study in [15]. The Figure shows the estimates from 28 February 2020 to 05 May 2020. A clear jump can be observed for 30 April and 01 May, indicating a likely increase in active transmission during these days.




Figure 7: Impact of two atypical events of high mobility, occurring on 30 April 2020 and 10 May 2020, on the baseline epidemic curve (blue line) with peak incidence on 03 June 2020. Scenarios I.1, I.2, II.1, and II.2 are represented by black line, black dashed line, red dashed line, and red line, respectively. a) daily incidence, b) cumulative incidence. In this plot, the increase of the total number of cases produced in the different scenarios is evident.




Figure 8: Impact of different times of mobility increase on the epidemic curve. Mobility increase is, for all cases, $10\omega_0$. Blue line, baseline epidemic curve. Black, red, gold, and green discontinuous lines show the scenarios when the mobility event starts four weeks before, a week before, a week after, and four weeks after peak incidence, respectively.




Figure 9: Impact of different times of mobility increase on the epidemic curve. Mobility increase is, for all cases, $5\omega_0$. Blue line, baseline epidemic curve. Black, red, gold, and green discontinuous lines show the scenarios when the mobility event starts four weeks before, a week before, a week after, and four weeks after peak incidence, respectively. a) Daily incidence curve; b) cumulative incidence curve. The equivalent effect for a May 10-like type of scenario on the curve, is represented by the black dashed line in both panels. In b) is coincides with the red dashed line.